



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/719,571	09/25/1996	DAVID J. ANDERSON	A-63899-1	9615

7590

08/06/2002

FLEHR HOHBACH TEST ALBRITTON & HERBERT  
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER  
SUITE 3400  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941114187

EXAMINER

GRUN, JAMES LESLIE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1641

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2002

34

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**08/719,571**

Applicant(s)  
**ANDERSON**

Examiner  
**James L. Grun, Ph.D.**

Art Unit  
**1641**



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-8, and 12-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-8, and 12-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1641

To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Technology Center 1600, Group 1640, Art Unit 1641.

The amendment filed 10 May 2002 is acknowledged and has been entered. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 12-16 remain in the case.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Applicant is now required to submit acceptable corrected drawings within the time period set in the Office action. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Submission of corrected drawings may no longer be held in abeyance pending the indication of allowable subject matter. Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application.

Claims 8 and 16, and claims 13-14 as dependent from claim 16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Stemple et al (Cell 71: 973-985, 1992) for reasons of record.

Applicant's arguments filed 10 May 2002 have been fully considered but they are again not deemed to be persuasive for the reasons of record that there remains no **factual evidence** of a difference between what is disclosed in the reference and what is instantly claimed. Applicant's arguments drawn to the initially isolated population of the reference were again not found

Art Unit: 1641

germane or persuasive with regard to the cloned cells of the reference noted in the rejection. As set forth, the cloned cells meet the limitations of the substantially pure population as instantly claimed. Applicant's arguments with regard to the different methods of isolation, i.e. "using antibody binding to RET protein" as instantly recited rather than the antibody to LNGFR, cloning, and serial subcloning of the reference, are also not dispositive of the issues as the process of making a product is not an element of the claimed invention. The process of making does not serve to limit or distinguish the same product made by another method from itself. Further, with regard to claim 16 and claims dependent thereupon, applicant admits that at least some of the cells cloned with the method of Stemple et al are also "Nps" (see e.g. specification page 26). The examiner would note again, with regard to claim 8, the disclosure of the reference that cloned cells were obtained which produced only nonneuronal cells such as glial cells (e.g.: page 977, col. 2; Table 2 (G + O); Fig. 7A (G + O)).

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo et al (Perspectives Dev. Neurobiol. 2: 191-201, 1994), Stemple et al (Dev. Biol. 159: 12-23, 1993), Stemple et al (Cell 71: 973-985, 1992), and Martucciello et al for reasons of record.

Applicant's arguments filed 10 May 2002 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

Art Unit: 1641

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Moreover, the Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Nomiya*, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975); *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re McLaughlin*, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969). Notwithstanding applicant's arguments to the contrary, the teachings of the other references combined with those of Lo et al in the instant rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) provide the methodological guidance and reagents for the cell isolation and culture desired by Lo et al and a reasonable expectation of success which applicant implies as lacking in the combination of teachings as set forth. Indeed, Lo et al teach (e.g. pages 194 and 199-200) expression of the *c-ret* gene in proliferating undifferentiated precursor cells, i.e. all primordia of the autonomic neuroendocrine system, the persistence of the marker in at least some stages of lineage commitment including as a progenitor of neuronal cells, and

Art Unit: 1641

specifically suggest that “the isolation” of these cells having this valuable marker “for very early stages in neural crest cell lineage diversification,” followed by their transplantation or culture “should provide a test of their degree of lineage commitment.” An expectation that **isolation should** provide further guidance on the commitment of such cells indicates that the reference, in contrast to applicant’s implications, had more than a reasonable expectation of success.

Applicant urges that the references of Stemple et al (1993) or Stemple et al (1992) do not specifically teach isolation of cells with anti-RET antibodies. This is not found persuasive as the disclosure of Lo et al specifically suggests the isolation of RET expressing cells and it would have been obvious to have used the notoriously old and well known methods of cell isolation taught in these references with available reagents for the reasons of record. It is also noted that an invention may be obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 even if a great amount of experimentation is required within the teachings of the prior art so long as that experimentation is within the abilities of one of ordinary skill in the art to carry out, i.e., it is routine. Notwithstanding applicant’s arguments to the contrary, absolute predictability is not required for one of ordinary skill in the art to have had a reasonable expectation of success in using the well known reagents and methods of the prior art with a marker known to the prior art to be expressed on cell surfaces of cells implicitly containing the gene expressed as the mRNA encoding the protein to provide the cell population desired by Lo et al.

In response to applicant's arguments that RET expression helps to isolate particular lineages of neural crest stem cells, the fact that Applicant has recognized another advantage

Art Unit: 1641

which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art, i.e. that the isolation of the cells should be done, cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Applicant's implication that the speculative development chart in Fig. 6 of Lo et al would teach away from the actual populations isolated is not found persuasive as the various cell populations are recited, in almost all of the instant claims, in the alternative and the reference of Lo et al clearly teaches RET expression in the cells which should be isolated, i.e. autonomic progenitor cells such as the proliferating undifferentiated neural crest precursor cells or those in which the marker persists during stages of lineage commitment including progenitors of neuronal cells and, possibly, glial cells (see e.g. Fig. 6 and page 194). Again, an invention may be obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 even if a great amount of experimentation is required within the teachings of the prior art so long as that experimentation is within the abilities of one of ordinary skill in the art to carry out, i.e., it is routine.

In response to applicant's implication that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the Applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Art Unit: 1641

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).


A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE **THREE MONTHS** FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST REPLY IS FILED WITHIN **TWO MONTHS** OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE **THREE-MONTH** SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EXPIRE LATER THAN **SIX MONTHS** FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James L. Grun, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 308-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, SPE, can be contacted at (703) 305-3399.

The phone numbers for official facsimile transmitted communications to TC 1600, Group 1640, are (703) 872-9306, or (703) 305-3014, or (703) 308-4242. Official After Final communications, only, can be facsimile transmitted to (703) 872-9307.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196. The above inquiries, or requests to supply missing elements from Office communications, can also be directed to the TC 1600 Customer Service Office at phone numbers (703) 308-0197 or (703) 308-0198.

  
James L. Grun, Ph.D.  
August 1, 2002

  
CHRISTOPHER L. CHIN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP ~~1800~~ 1641